

CORRESPONDENCE

German Eugenics Exhibition

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—Mrs. Hodson and I have recently returned from Berlin, where we visited the great Exhibition of "The German People—German Work." Mrs. Hodson, as Honorary Secretary of the International Federation of Eugenic Organizations, of which Professor Rüdin, of Munich, is President, was an official representative of that body, and was able therefore to interview many influential people in the German eugenics world, and to gather much useful information as to how the German Sterilization Act is being carried out. She is producing a book on sterilization, which will contain this information, and is being published by Messrs. C. A. Watts & Co. this month (see p. 150).

The Exhibition was opened with great éclat by Herr Goebbels. In his opening oration he declaimed against Marxismus, which he said was dead—in Germany at any rate—but he appeared to be very much preoccupied with the corpse. The Exhibition itself is an enormous affair—both in quantity and quality. It is mainly an industrial show, like the *Daily Mail* "Ideal Home," but it is far more ambitious and instructive. You enter a great hall hung with banners and guarded by medieval musketeers on the one side and the S.S. and the S.A. on the other. There are enormous and extremely telling, if sometimes somewhat crude, captions on all the walls, and you are at once informed that in order to guide the Future, and understand the Present, of Germany, you must know her Past. Then follows an historical pageant, glorifying the Greatness of Germany—the Conqueror of the Roman Empire and founder of a wonderful culture 500 B.C. "Germans must never regard their ancestors as barbarians." The three Empires are portrayed at some length by map, diagram and picture. They are, of course: (1) The Empire of the Middle Ages; (2) The Empire of Bismarck; and (3) The Empire of Adolf Hitler.

After the historical pageant, you are told further that in order to understand the German people and their work you must know their biological foundations—and then follows a Eugenic Section of the deepest interest, extremely well set out and on the whole very fair. For example, there is comparatively little about the Jews, and the point stressed is that alien races are all right in themselves and provided they keep themselves to themselves, but that they must not be allowed to "poison the good German blood." Their main grievance, which is described in two separate parts of the Exhibition as "the saddest betrayal of the white race," is the problem of the 600 black bastards on the Rhine. Of these unfortunate

children there were a number of photographs (and they are not unattractive to look at), over which was inscribed: "The occupation of the Rhine is at an end, 600 black bastards remain." These were said to be the result of "black Frenchmen," and to constitute "the invasion of the black races in Europe."

But even a grievance such as this—large as it may loom—is recognized as a side issue. By far the largest part of this section is taken up by population problems of various kinds—the fall in and the differential birth-rate, and the growing burden of taxation to support the infirm, the aged* and the mentally defective. The method of working and the necessity of the German Sterilization Act is most efficiently set out at great length—much too long to describe here—but diagrams may be seen at the offices of this *Society*. This section ends with the warning that the law for the protection of posterity must not be confused with the law for the punishment of sexual crimes, and describes the difference between sterilization and castration.

May I end with three from amongst the many striking captions:

1. "Which is best? To build decent homes for our healthy people—or country estates for our lunatics?"

2. "A sound people can be enslaved, oppressed, dismembered—but not exterminated. A nation can only be blotted out and exterminated by its own unfruitfulness. That is the most dangerous enemy of any people."

3. "The only group which still has a preponderance of births over deaths is that of the hereditarily diseased. Ever more and more they propagate themselves in the body of the German people."

Much space is devoted to many other aspects of this great problem, and notably to the "Law for promoting marriages." One final quotation: "The State population policy is not at an end with these measures—many problems remain over for solution."

Comment is superfluous.

URSULA GRANT DUFF.

London.

Genetics of Intellect

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—I believe that several psychologists who, like myself, listened at the Leicester B.A.A.S. meeting to Dr. Hurst's paper on "The Genetics of Intellect" (which you have just published),

* Now more than double the proportion in 1900 to the whole population.

were impressed by his genetics, but were in profound disagreement with his psychological fundamentals. Naturally I have no right to speak for others, yet I conjecture that the majority of psychologists who have worked in the field of mental testing would subscribe to the following criticisms:

1. Without for a moment impugning Dr. Hurst's attempts at impartiality, or his knowledge of his Leicester families, I would hold that it is quite impossible for a single investigator to make valid assessments of people's intellects. His ratings might indeed correlate to about +0.70 with the results of objective tests, but their subjectivity makes such ratings quite unsuitable for elaborate statistical or genetical treatment.

2. Dr. Woods's gradings of Royal families are likely to be still more unreliable. A would-be scientific psychologist would not put any trust in the "histriometrical" method, for "the adjectives used by biographers, historians and encyclopædists" are certain to reflect very largely the prejudices of these writers for or against the personages in question.

3. The work of Terman, Spearman, Thorndike and others has shown beyond doubt that intellect, or *g*, when reliably measured, accords with the normal or Gaussian distribution curve. The mere fact that Dr. Hurst grades 72.6 per cent. of his subjects as "mediocre" in intellect, instead of the normal 24.6 per cent., shows that his grades were not, as he states, of equal mathematical value, but were arbitrary and subjective divisions.

4. Since the genetical conclusions seem to be based largely upon the distributions of the populations within these grades, it is difficult to see how the conclusions can be accepted.

5. Dr. Hurst finds that "popular theories of the origin of grades of intellect by education, free will, family environment, or simple heredity" are disproved by his data. Psychologists do not, of course, nowadays ascribe intellect to free will, nor to *simple* heredity; but they have indubitable objective evidence that education and family endowment do play a certain part in its determination. Some are still inclined to an environmentalistic, some to a predominantly hereditary, viewpoint. Others, including myself, note that careful investigators, such as Freeman and Burks in America, and Hugh Gordon, Miss Lawrence and Shepherd Dawson in Great Britain, have obtained definite proofs of the influence of both factors. We are therefore content to accept Kelley's conclusion that the relative influence of these factors in adults is about fifty-fifty. If then Dr. Hurst's data are incompatible with the scientific investigations of mental testers, it is the former, not the latter, which must be rejected.

In conclusion I would point out that the whole topic rests upon the definition and delimitation of intellect. It is still quite legitimate to believe in the existence of a purely innate general ability which

is entirely determined by some form of Mendelian inheritance. But since no means have been discovered for measuring this innate ability, it is necessary to accept the pooled result of a battery of suitable mental tests, i.e. *g*, as a substitute which does at least possess some scientific reliability; and it is to this conception which I refer in the above observations.

P. E. VERNON.

The Maudsley Hospital,
Denmark Hill,
London, S.E.5.

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—In reply to Dr. Vernon's criticisms, may I say that:

1. In no case were the Leicestershire gradings of intellect assessed by a single investigator, and that in most cases three or more persons took part in the ratings. The adult gradings were based entirely on objective achievements and were no more subjective than the marking of scores in the standardized mental tests. The reliability of these ratings was checked from time to time during a period of twenty-five years and it is estimated that they correlate higher with "*g*" than do the batteries of mental tests which, though excellent for juveniles and adolescents, were found impossible to apply to adults in general. It was found also that the ratings conform closely with occupational status (allowing a five-point scale for each occupation).

2. Dr. Woods's gradings and data of Royal families are quite independent and are regarded as accessory rather than essential to the investigation.

3. The work of Terman, Thomson and others shows clearly that intellect, or "*g*," does *not* accord with the normal frequency distribution curve; on the contrary, in the region of 90 to 110 I.Q. there is a high peak of mediocrity of about 50 per cent., similar to that found in the Leicestershire and Royal families, instead of the expected 24.6 per cent. of the normal curve. On the other hand the *mn* individuals of these families do accord closely with the normal frequency curve. These frequency differences cannot therefore be attributed to the grading and must have a genetical basis.

4. Genetical conclusions are of necessity based on families and not on populations, and my genetical conclusions were derived from both an analysis and a synthesis of individual families and not from the general distribution of the population.

5. My data confirm the point that education and family environment have some influence in the development of intellect, and are therefore *not* incompatible with the investigations of mental testers. The vital point, however, is whether education and family environment can, of themselves, *originate* grades of intellect without a